UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,073	12/23/2004	Atsushi Fukui	MAM-056	7337
20374 KUBOVCIK &	7590 05/12/200 KUBOVCIK	EXAMINER		
SUITE 1105	TADIZ CEDEET	LEE, CYNTHIA K		
ARLINGTON,	LARK STREET VA 22202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/519,073	FUKUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CYNTHIA LEE	1795	

	CYNTHIA LEE	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	date of the final rejectio	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	,, ,	3 1 7 3	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/PATRICK RYAN/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with regards to the Objection to the Specification and the 35 USC 112, 1st rejection have been considered and are persuasive. The Objection and the Rejection have been withdrawn.

Applicant's prior art arguments have been considered and are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the properties desired of the platinum black air cathode for producing ozone of Solomon are not the same properties required for the negative electrode. Applicant argues that the Office has not provided proper rationale supporting its position. In response, although Solomon's invention pertains to a cathode and not an anode, it is noted that both Solomon and Nobufumi pertain to the art of battery and thus, the combination is proper. Further, because applying the process of Solomon would entail predictable results, it is noted that the combination would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding Applicant's arguments regarding Battery B5, the Examiner notes that the current collector used b2 in Table 13 was not surface-roughened and was not sintered above the melting temperature.

Regarding Applicant's arguments on criticality, it is noted that the combination of prior art has been found to structurally read on the instant claims, and thus inherently possesses the claimed properties.